

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

The Examiner is thanked for the Final Official Action dated June 10, 2010. This amendment and request for reconsideration is intended to be fully responsive thereto.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 11, 30 and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Coupland et al. (USPN 4,821,518). Claims 8, 10 and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coupland in view of Freeman (US 2,321,479). The applicant respectfully disagrees.

The Examiner further noted that claims 12-17 were objected to as being dependent upon the rejected base claim 1, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitation of the base claim and any intervening claims.

In order to expedite prosecution of the present application, claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of the allowable claim 12 including the limitations of the intervening claim 11. No new matter has been added. Claims 11 and 12 have been canceled. Claims 13 and 33 have been amended to depend upon claim 1. No new matter has been added.


Claim 30 has also been canceled. No new matter has been added.

Claim 18 was allowed.

Appl. No. 10/576,371  
In re Villata et al.  
Reply to Final Office Action of Jun. 10, 2010

It is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 8, 10, 13-18, 31 and 33 define the invention over the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance, and notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner believe further discussion regarding the above claim language would expedite prosecution they are invited to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted:

By:   
George Ayvazov  
Reg. N° 37,483

Berenato & White, LLC  
Suite 240  
6550 Rock Spring Drive  
Bethesda, Maryland 20817  
(301) 896-0600